Mary J. Wright, C. Roger Myers, (Eds.). *History of Academic Psychology in Canada.* Toronto: C.J. Hogrefe, Inc., 1982, 259 pp.

It is often said that good things come in small packages. Unfortunately, such is not the case with respect to this slender paperback volume which purports "to describe the development of psychology in Canada as an academic discipline". Both the title of the book and its stated purpose are misleading.

True, accounts of how psychology found its way into Canadian universities are described, but only twelve of Canada's 70-some degree-granting institutions are represented, and one of the oldest and most reputable of the French-language universities, Laval, is omitted. The limitation imposed by the editors is said to be that only universities "in which doctoral programs in psychology had been developed before 1960" were included; yet several of the institutions described did not implement doctoral programs until after the prescribed date and did not grant any doctorates until well on in the 1960's. Furthermore, this is not a history in the accepted sense. As one of the contributing authors said, it is more in the nature of a biography. Interspersed between nostalgic anecdotes about the characters and reputations of various personalities who either taught or chaired departments or were among the more illustrious graduates in psychology, one finds material resembling either advertising brochures designed to attract enrolment, or excerpts lifted directly from university calendars listing names and descriptions of courses, qualifications of faculty, and available awards.

An attempt to place some of the data in a social or historical context comes through as contrived and simplistic. In some cases, it creates a totally misleading impression. This is doubly worrisome when one considers that the book may be placed on the prescribed reading lists for psychology students in Canadian universities, and perhaps some outside of Canada. It is cause for concern, for example, to find on page 2 of the Introduction the astonishing claim that "for nearly a century the efforts of the French-speaking inhabitants of Quebec to obtain a university were unsuccessful, in part, because the Protestant British were suspicious of 'Romish' education".

This kind of loose and unsupportable generalization is more suited to a separatist propaganda tract than a scholarly publication. As such, it cannot be left unchallenged, even at the risk of a digression into the past.

As Robin Harris emphasized in his *History of Higher Education Canada, 1663-1960,* the roots of higher education in Quebec far precede those of any English-language institution. It is true, nonetheless, that during the long and difficult period of adjustment after the conquest and while the work of the Jesuits who had assumed responsibility for education in the colony was curtailed, their order being in disrepute, education at all levels suffered. However, as well respected French-language historian, L.-P. Audet, reports in Volume I of his *Histoire de l'enseignement au Québec. 1608-1840,* the abysmal state of education in the colony worried Governor Murray as much as it did the colony's French-speaking leaders. Despite Murray's efforts to remedy the situation, the confused and

troubled politics of the times militated against quick or easy remedies. While Sir Guy Carleton was Governor, he set up a committee in 1787 whose mandate was to draw up a plan to meet the educational needs of both French and English inhabitants. Made up of spokesmen for all parties, including the Roman Catholic church, the Committee recommended that a dual-language system be set up to serve all sectors of the colony. It would encompass all levels of education from elementary to university.

Audet states that there was to be a university "dans laquelle l'enseignement de la théologie aurait été exclu afin de ne pas heurter les convictions religieuses des catholiques et des protestants. Cette institution aurait d'ailleurs été au sommet d'une organisation beaucoup plus considérable et très centralisée comprenant une école élémentaire dans chaque paroisse, une école d'un niveau plus élevé dans chaque comté, le tout sous l'autorité de l'Université de Québec." (Audet, *Histoire*, I, 331).

This bold scheme received the unqualified support of Roman Catholic adjutor Bishop Bailly de Messein, the British authorities approved it, and a French-speaking lawyer, Simon Sanguinet, offered a large sum of money to establish the university; but to the chagrin of everyone concerned, it was never implemented. Bishop Hubert of Quebec rejected it on the grounds that the Habitant were not ready for an educational system over which the Roman Catholic church did not have ultimate control. Bishop de Messein publicly denounced the stand of his superior, but Bishop Hubert had quickly obtained official sanction from Rome to block the plan. This put an end to any hope for a publicly supported bilingual, non-confessional school system in Quebec.

In reporting on this venture, Audet offers the comments of McGill University's first native-born principal, J.W. Dawson, who stressed that "it shows that from the very first the English colonists desired to erect a public school and university system", but they had no desire to interfere with any existing seminaries or schools or to prevent the French-speaking inhabitants from being educated in their own separate schools. Dawson went on to say that, "had this wise scheme been carried into effect immediately and with vigor, the whole future history of Lower Canada might have been different, not only educationally but politically; and a great impulse would have been given to the industrial progress of the people". (Audet, *Histoire* I, 340). These words written in 1864 were remarkably, and sadly prescient.

A charter for Laval University was eventually sanctioned, but its implementation was delayed while the Roman Catholic clergy argued over the kind of structure to be adopted – a federated body like Toronto, or one institution to which all of the classical colleges would be affiliated. Agreement was finally reached on the latter plan and Laval received its charter in 1852. As for the University of Montreal, its efforts to become more than just a campus of Laval were also thwarted – not by the British – but once again by ecclesiastical wrangling between the Bishops of Montreal and Quebec. Speaking of this unseemly quarrel, Audet says, "Le projet d'établir une université à Montréal reste l'une des

pages les plus complexes et parfois les plus disgracieuses de l'histoire de enseignement au Québec." (Audet, *Histoire,* II, 149).

One may sympathize with the editors of this book in trying to compress over two centuries of history in a short paragraph, but there is no excuse for them not getting their facts straight, especially since much of the above information appears in the Harris book, their alleged source. One must ask, why did they bother to include this kind of material, or the truncated chronologies of the universities listed at the beginning and the end of the book, or for that matter the futile attempt made in the Epilogue to summarize and analyze the unprecedented expansion in higher education that occurred in the 1960's. A better book might have emerged had the editors exercised some restriction and carried out more careful research and editing, at least of their own material.

Other textual problems also cannot be easily overlooked: the frequent lapses in style characterized by the lack of variety in length and kind of sentences, the underdeveloped paragraphs, the absence of transition, the loose and faulty generalizations, the non-sequitors. Since most of these faults appear in the Introduction, Overview, and the Epilogue, the editors must take the responsibility. This raises another question: how did so poorly conceived and unscholarly a production merit financial support from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council?

On a more positive note, thanks to some of the contributing authors, the book is not entirely without redemption. It contains interesting data about the way in which psychology found its way into the universities and the difficulties that were encountered enroute. It is evident, for instance, that almost without exception the teaching of psychology began as an adjunct to that mainstay of the 19th and early 20th century university curriculum, Mental and Moral Philosophy. While it was a convenient door through which to enter, over the years there was a constant struggle to free psychology from philosophy. In most cases the battle was won sometime during the 1940's, but there were some exceptions.

Thomas Nelson reports that at the University of Alberta psychology was taught as a separate course from the day the institution opened its doors, but the subject did not appear in the departmental title until 1933-1934. Not until the 1960's was a separate department of psychology created, the first doctoral degree being granted in 1965, just three years ahead of the University of British Columbia.

According to Morgan W. Wright, the University of Manitoba adopted a unique compromise to resolve the differences between the philosophers and the psychologists. For many years two incumbents rotated annually as head of the department. When the man whose leanings were toward philosophy was in charge, the department was listed in the annual report as the department of philosophy and psychology; when the alternate head took over, it was referred to as the department of psychology and philosophy. In 1947, the decision was made to create a separate department for each field.

While this controversy was in progress, another arose among the psychologists themselves, with those favouring the experimentalist approach in one camp, and those preferring the applied or clinical approach in the other. The route followed

by a university at any given time depended to some extent on where the incumbent chairman had taken his training. At Saskatchewan and U.B.C., for example, the stress was more on the applied side, their respective chairmen having come from McGill and Toronto. This problem was more or less resolved at Alberta in the early 1960's when Arts and Science was split into two separate faculties, with the experimentalists lodged in the faculty of science, and their counterparts in the faculty of arts. In 1966, Alberta took the bold step of establishing a Centre for Advanced Study in Theoretical Psychology, a first in the world.

At the French-language University of Montreal where, because of its sectarian foundations, psychology was taught from a strongly religious-Thomistic point of view, the quarrel between the experimentalists and the applied psychologists brought forth a demand for the granting of two separate doctoral degrees. Luc Granger reports that this issue had not been resolved at the time of preparation of the book; however, as Granger points out, the Canadian Psychological Association has already recognized the need for separation by establishing applied and experimental divisions within its own organization. He hopes that this move will favourably affect the outcome of the deliberations at Montreal.

As the University of Manitoba a similar debate has been in progress, and Morgan Wright admits that "certainly at one time, professional psychologists sat outside department doors, waiting for whatever crumbs of recognition and support came their way. Now there is almost a role-reversal. . .with the majority of graduate students opting for applied programs and careers". It is suggested that the issue, which "involves [both] balancing the values of research and practice" and the consideration of "whether a separate doctoral degree. . .is appropriate for students working towards professional careers", presents a genuine challenge to all heads of departments of psychology, wherever they may reside (176).

Writing on McMaster University, Lynn Newbigging states what may well be the conviction of a number of academic psychologists – that "experimental and applied psychology are almost distinct disciplines based on different values with different objectives, and that each would prosper better if these differences were acknowledged by administrative separation" (135-36).

Whether this is a legitimate stance or not, it would seem imperative that the psychologists make up their minds as to how best to satisfy the aspirations of both sides. This is all the more urgent since, according to the Director of OISE, Bernard Shapiro, a third divisive factor is in the making – a rift between the community-minded applied psychologists and the clinical researchers. Writing in the January 1983 edition of the *CCSE News*, Shapiro speaks of some of the current ills besetting the educational psychologists in particular. He identifies some of the general confusion among this group of professionals as to their aims and goals. Alluding to "the collapse of the social consensus" concerning the value of psychology in education and community activity, "of which the collapse of the idea of a core curriculum is merely a symptom", Shapiro says that this should surprise no one. It, along with other factors such as the budget squeeze facing all universities, "leads quite naturally to self-examination not to say self-

criticism and self-doubt". He admits that the "successes" of the educational psychologists "have not been comfortably frequent", and he believes that "if the field is to emerge more fully as a strong behavioural science", psychologists in this area first will have to develop "a more liberal understanding of the 'model' educational psychologist" and, second, they must allow for "substantial redirection of the working process that we call educational psychology".

Shapiro claims that educational psychology, like medicine, is an applied rather than an academic discipline in which its practitioners have an "enormous fondness for statistics and methodology". Whether this is true of medical practitioners is open to debate, but one has only to scan the articles in journals dedicated to educational psychology to find ample support for Shapiro's claim. To counter the imbalance, Shapiro urges that more liberal arts be taught at the undergraduate level, and he also would like educational psychologists to be obliged to take teacher training and obtain teaching experience – before they go out into the field as advisors and counsellors in schools. This would mean more stringent standards of training, but he feels that, despite the loss of some candidates who would not measure up, it is a necessary and worthy innovation.

Educational psychology, *per se,* is given scant attention in the Wright-Myers book. On the whole, the contributors tend not to stress either incipient or long-standing weaknesses in the field. There are hints of the way in which the "hard" scientists in academe have tried to avoid having the experimental psychologists invade their territory; although there are some examples where the latter have not only been welcomed, but helped along the way. Some of the difficulties faced by the applied psychologists have already been mentioned, especially at Manitoba. Another serious issue raised is one which faces all academic disciplines, not just psychology – how to deal with "the political insistence that universities directly address manpower needs". According to Thomas Nelson, in his own department of psychology at Alberta, "the most pressing immediate question is how to accommodate the desire on the part of the provincial government for expanded and upgraded clinical programs". These two questions are linked to a more general problem: "to what extent will the department be capable of devising teaching and research programs that will usefully combine academic rigour with social concerns, while at the same time avoiding the negative features of applied psychology?" (217). Morgan Wright also expressed his concern over the effects on "academic standards in the face of applied training pressures" (176).

Nelson is likely realistic when he concludes that "it seems inevitable that renewed integration of psychological research and teaching with problems of community interest will have high priority in the years to come" (217). He further suggests that, if psychologists do not respond to such demands, the necessary changes will be imposed on them from outside.

It seems clear that many serious challenges face contemporary psychologists, and a book such as this might have been useful in delineating them and in trying to point to more promising directions. While some of the authors did make worthy contributions, by and large the text is cluttered with trivia, with claims for the high reputations of professors, or of departments (dubiously based on the

numbers of students they attract), with the number of items professors have published, with how many psychological journals are located on their campuses, or with how many times psychologists have quoted other psychologists in such journals. Indeed, it is a chilling thought that succeeding generations of psychologists may be citing some of the superficial and specious claims contained in this particular publication.

Despite its textual weaknesses, there are some highlights. The style and overall approach of Professors Page and Clark who tell the story of Dalhousie make pleasant reading, and Morgan Wright's deft description of events at Manitoba provides a welcome relief from the otherwise dull commentaries. Thomas Nelson's description of Alberta's experiences is couched in clear scholarly language, but the treatment of the older institutions in eastern Canada, while often well written, suffers from unavoidable repetition, their stories being too much alike.

In the main, the book was neither intelligently conceived nor rigorously executed, and it falls somewhat short of being a worthy contribution to the lore of higher education in Canada. More's the pity, considering the resources that were spent on it and the wide distribution it likely will enjoy.

Gwendoline Pilkington
University of Toronto

Response to the reviewer of *Scholars and Dollars.*
Commentary from Paul Axelrod.

I am delighted that James A. McAllister finds *Scholars and Dollars* to be an "important" book. But I am disappointed that in his criticisms, he both distorts much of its contents, and makes impossible demands, consistent with what he thought the book should have been about.

On the discussion of business-university relations, which McAllister describes as the weakest part of the book, he has misread the text and misled his audience as to its substance. He observes (as though discovering a major flaw in the book's thesis) that businessmen on boards of governors played a relatively small role in the daily affairs of universities. This is precisely *my* point. The question I therefore set out to answer was why so much effort was spent by universities recruiting important businessmen to serve on boards. Surely, the book is explicit and clear on this point (see especially pp. 62-3). Because of their status, prominent businessmen legitimized universities (particularly the newer ones) in the eyes of government and the public. Business-led boards lobbied government, tapped their own connections in the corporate community for support and funding, and contributed money of their own.

Businessmen were involved minimally in curriculum and professional development largely because they had little experience in these areas, leaving these tasks to administrators and academics. Like most Canadians, businessmen believed that all investment in higher education (from engineering to fine arts) would be profitable in a time of economic growth and severe manpower shortages. (How the